DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 122 HE 017 951

AUTHOR Cardozier, V. R.
TITLE The Upper Level College Revisited. Higher Education Series, Topical Paper 8401.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Dept. of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Students; *College Choice; *College Curriculum; College Transfer Students; Enrollment Trends; Extracurricular Activities; Geographic Location; Higher Education; *Prerequisites; School Location; State Universities; *Upper Division Colleges

ABSTRACT

The concept and history of upper-level colleges, which offer junior and senior years of study leading to bachelor's degrees, are reviewed. Most of the colleges have offered master's degree programs in addition to junior- and senior-level studies. Planners intended that most of the upper-level colleges be placed in geographical areas where no public baccalaureate institutions existed, but where junior colleges were present. By spring 1983, there was a high level of disenchantment with this type of college. Problems concerned enrollments, transfer courses, curriculum planning, degree programs, student life activities, and community service courses. Enrollments in these colleges fell far short of expectations, and the lack of freshman and sophomore courses posed difficulties for many transfer students. Upper-level colleges concentrated the student's study on the major program rather than general education courses. Some requirements at the upper-level colleges are restrictive to many adult students, and these colleges tend to lack student life activities. There is also a tendency for the brightest high school graduates to go away to college rather than attend the nearby upper-level college. Information on specific upper-level institutions is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED252122

THE UPPER LEVEL COLLEGE REVISITED

V. R. Cardozier

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. R. Cardozier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 019 951

Departmental of Educational Adminstration

The University of Texas at Austin

1984

THE UPPER LEVEL COLLEGE REVISITED

V. R. Cardozier

Professor of Higher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Topical Paper 8401

Higher Education Series

Departmental of Educational Adminstration

The University of Texas at Austin

1984

PREFACE

Since the establishment of Harvard, the first American college, in 1636, American higher education has experimented with a sizeable number of alternative approaches , employing differing structures, curricula, length of study, degree requirements and many more.

One such experiment is the upper level model -- an institution offering junior and senior years of study leading to bachelors' degrees and relying on junior colleges to provide the first two years of study.

The first attempt to employ this model, after colleges began to require high school graduation for admission, was the University of Chicago at the turn of the century. With a few exceptions, the idea lay dormant until the 1960s when it was revived and during the 1960s and 1970s, some 25 upper level colleges and universities were created.

This treatise reviews the underlying rationale for the upper level model, the history and development of those institutions during the 1960s and 1970s and assesses the validity of the upper level model and its future prospects.

A truncated and somewhat revised version of this paper appeared in the summer 1984 issue of The Educational Record.

V.R.C.

THE UPPER LEVEL COLLEGE REVISITED

V. R. Cardozier*

In June 1970, a national conference on upper level colleges was held on the campus of the University of West Florida (in Pensacola), one of the new upper level institutions in that state. At that time, Florida had established two upper level universities and had two more on the drawing board which would open in 1972.

The conference was well attended by officials of newly established upper level institutions and higher education coordinating agencies and university officials in states that were planning new upper level institutions or considering establishing them. Texas was well represented by university campus and system officials and the state higher education coordinating agency since it was in the midst of establishing the largest number of upper level institutions of any state.

Enthusiasm for the upper level concept was high. Speakers and panels set forth advantages of the upper level concept and hailed it as a model for higher education in the future. None discussed potential limitations that would impair the upper levels' success; indeed, the possibility of upper level institutions not succeeding was not considered.

---

*Professor of Higher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

But the upper level model proved not to be the panacea many had envisioned.

In the spring of 1983, the Florida legislature, after several years of debate, enacted legislation authorizing all of the upper level universities in Florida to accept freshmen and sophomores, thus signaling the disenchantment of legislators and administrators of upper level institutions in that state with the concept.

During the interim period, ten upper level institutions opened in Texas. Between 1964 and 1976, some 25 upper level institutions were established in eleven states, most of them modeled on the Florida upper level universities. But,by the spring of 1983, most administrators and faculty in upper level colleges and universities throughout the country had concluded that although some of the predicted advantages of upper level institutions were valid, most of them were not and the problems not foreseen by planners of upper level institutions so handicapped them as to invalidate the concept.

Although two upper level institutions offer the Ph.D. degree and three offer only the bachelor's degree, most of them offer master's degree programs in addition to junior and senior level studies.

It was the intention of the planners that most of the upper level institutions be placed in geographical areas where no public baccalaureate institution existed but which already had one or more junior colleges that would provide lower division preparation.

Disenchantment with the upper level model among administrators and faculty in those institutions came gradually. Initially, the concept was greeted with excitement. Faculty saw advantages in being able to concentrate on teaching the substance of their disciplines to advanced undergraduates while avoiding the sometimes unpleasant freshman and general

education courses. Administrators were pleased to be rid of the chore of dealing with the large number of lower division students, some of whom are not serious about college and who create many of the problems in an institution.

By 1979, the mood had changed among the upper level institutions' leadership. At a meeting of upper level college presidents and chancellors in Williamsburg, Virginia, in November 1979, the group was polled concerning their assessment of the upper level concept. None supported it. All said they had gone to their institutions enthusiastic about the upper level model but, based on their experiences, had concluded that it was faulty. All favored conversion of their institutions to four-year status.

One president remarked that the only people who support the upper level concept are those who have had no experience with it, referring to the fact that the strongest advocates of the upper level model are legislators and state higher education officials who have never served in an upper level institution. One president said, "The only justification of upper level institutions is political." And another added, "It was a poor idea from the beginning." A chancellor said, "With the random assortment of lower division courses that students bring to upper level institutions, it is impossible to assure that students get programs of study that have coherence and academic integrity." Others added various reasons for their conclusions that the upper level model had proved to be a mistake.

It should be noted that only three-fourths of the presidents and chancellors of upper level institutions were present. Further, this was not a public meeting and several presidents and chancellors prefer not to

take a public position on the question in the interest of maintaining good relations with junior colleges in their areas and with political leaders and state higher education officials who continue to advocate the upper level model.

This analysis deals with the experiences of upper level institutions, in general, but draws more heavily on those in Texas where ten of the 24 or so upper level institutions are found. In 1969, the Texas Legislature enacted legislation establishing two upper level universities and in 1971 added three more. About the same time, five upper level centers were established by existing universities. Each of the five is located on a junior college campus and rents space, facilities, and services from the junior college. They have resident faculties and administrative staffs and, with one exception, award their own degrees and are headed by a president or chancellor. They differ considerably from extension centers found throughout the country that offer upper level courses and normally have few or no resident faculty and do not award their own degrees. Hence, extension centers are not included in this analysis of upper level institutions.

Great Expectations. Upper level institutions developed as a result of three primary factors. First was the explosion in college attendance that occurred during the 1960s , the reason for the establishment of so many new four-year colleges and universities. Historically, most four-year colleges and universities had been located in rural communities or small towns. As new institutions were established in the 1950s and 1960s , most were located in centers of population. Prior to 1970, there was no public baccalaureate level college in the Texas cities of Dallas, San Antonio or Corpus Christi, nor in the Florida cities of Boca Raton, Miami, Jacksonville or

Pensacola. Upper level universities were placed in all of them, except San Antonio where a four-year university was established.

In Illinois, an upper level university was placed in Springfield, the first public baccalaureate institution in the capitol city of that state, and one in Park Forest South to serve a large population south of Chicago.

Richmond College was established in 1965 due to the absence of a baccalaureate institution on Staten Island in New York City. Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, is located in the downtown area to serve a different clientele from that at the University of Minnesota across the river in Minneapolis.

While most of the upper level institutions were established in large population centers, all five of the upper level centers and two of the upper level universities in Texas were located in smaller cities or population areas under 200,000.

The second consideration was cost. Planners assumed that two years at a junior college and two years at an upper level institution would cost the state less than four years at a state university. At the time upper level institutions were established in Texas, most junior college costs were born by local junior college taxing districts. Since then, the Legislature has increased the state's share of junior college funding. In addition, salaries of faculty and administrators in junior colleges have increased markedly in recent years, in many cases exceeding those in state universities.

Legislators and state higher education planners had apparently not fully calculated the costs of conducting junior and senior classes of 15 to 30 students with Ph.D. faculty in institutions without lower division

classes of 100 to 200 or sections taught by teaching fellows to balance teaching costs.

In the late 1970s, the cost per student, in state and local tax dollars combined, for two years of education at a public junior college and two years at an upper level university exceeded four years at several state universities in Texas.

The third consideration in the establishment of upper level institutions was fear that four-year institutions would decrease enrollments in nearby junior colleges. This was a major factor in Texas where the newly established Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, encountered strong opposition to additional four-year colleges from junior colleges. Texas has, and then had, a strong network of community/junior colleges, currently some 60 campuses across the state. Junior college leadership in Texas has for many years been highly effective in the state capitol and has significant impact on any legislation which they believe will affect their institutions. The same situation exists in Florida and to some extent in most other states.

Richmond College, on Staten Island, was originally planned to be a four-year college but,due to strong and effective opposition by Staten Island Community College and its supporters, among other factors, Richmond was established as an upper level college.[1] Opposition from community college leadership and supporters effectively blocked four-year institutions in several cities and communities where upper level institutuions were eventually located.

What happened in the new upper level institutions to lead to disenchantment with them and with the upper level model ?

Enrollment. The most obvious one was enrollment for, with few exceptions, upper level institutions fell far short of enrollment expectations. This got the attention of legislators and more than any other reason caused many legislators to become negative about upper level institutions generally. It became a sore point with university system administrators and officials of statewide coordinating agencies. Community leaders who had envisioned the new universities funneling large payrolls into the local economy and students from outside the area spending substantial sums in their communities were disillusioned and disappointed.

Finally, failures to achieve enrollment projections set forth by planners got the attention of the press, both in Florida and Texas. The press reminded its audiences many times over the years of the enrollment shortfalls in upper level institutions in those states without investigating the bases on which some of those projections were made. Nor did they explore adequately the structural flaws in the upper level model.

It was not that enrollment deficiencies could not have been antcipated. The University of Michigan had established upper level campuses at Flint (1956) and at Dearborn (1959) but enrollment in both fell far short of expectations and freshmen and sophomores were added in 1965 and 1971, respectively. E. K. Fretwell, then with the staff of the City University of New York, in building a case for an upper level college on Staten Island in 1965, cited these shortfalls and also pointed out that Florida Atlantic University, the then newly established upper level campus at Boca Raton,

Florida, had not met its enrollment projections, but Fretwell attributed the cause to factors other than the inherent problems of the upper level model.[2]

Although academic deficiencies in the upper level model appears to have been a major factor in the Florida decision to convert all upper level universities, editorial and news stories in Florida newspapers repeatedly cited failure of the upper level universities to meet enrollment projections. Yet, to administrators of upper level institutions in Texas, Florida's upper level universities reached adequate enrollment levels. The smallest upper level university in Florida, the University of North Florida at Jacksonville, with a 1981 enrollment of 5,186, was larger than eight of Texas' ten upper level institutions. Eight years after opening, seven of Texas' upper level institutions enrolled fewer than 2,000 students each and the eighth enrolled fewer than 3,000 .

Those responsible for planning upper level institutions made several erroneous assumptions. They assumed that by establishing an upper level college near one or more community colleges, students who would otherwise go away to college would remain in their communities and complete the baccalaureate degree there. This did not occur, at least not to any significant extent.

While enrollments grew in community colleges during the 1970s, in many cases the growth was in vocational-technical subjects. For example, according to the Texas Coordinating Board, Odessa (Junior) College produced 26,742 semester credits in 1968-69; in 1977-78, four years after the University of Texas of the Permian Basin opened, four miles away, Odessa College produced 20,789 academic semester credits, a decline of 23 percent.[3] Total enrollment for Odessa College increased some 40 percent over that period with the difference accounted for by enrollments in vocational-technical education.

Based on his research at the Center for Community Colleges at the University of California at Los Angeles, Jack Friedlander reported that by 1978 vocational enrollment in community/junior colleges nationally exceeded 50 percent.[4] While this signified a commendable shift among community colleges to serve the educational and occupational needs of their respective communities, the result was little or no increase in preparation of transfer students.

Second, the assumption that most students who attend community colleges would transfer to the nearby upper level college also proved to be overstated. Statistics collected by the Texas Coordinating Board showed that about 65 percent of the community college students who transferred to a senior college or university went to a four-year, not an upper level, institution.

Third, the planners did not collect data on the numbers of then current transfers from junior colleges to universities and grossly overestimated that figure. That information was not then available. Beginning in the mid-70s , the Texas Coordinating Board staff began to collect from public universities in the state the numbers of incoming transfer students and the institutions from which they transferred. With these data, they could determine the number of students transferring from each community college to a public university in Texas each semester. This omitted junior college students who transferred to private universities and to out-of-state institutuions,but these were estimated to be relatively small. The system also does not account for duplicate transfers. For example, a student who enrolled at a four-year college, then took a course at a community college during the following summer and enrolled at a second four-year college the

next fall is considered to be a junior college transfer student. A Texas Coordinating Board staff member estimated this group to account for as many as 20 percent of the junior college transfers.

The Texas Coordinating Board figures showed that in the late 1970s about half of the community college students who transferred to public baccalaureate institutions did so after completing one year of study or less and were therefore ineligible for admission to an upper level institution. For example, in the 1980 fall semester 2,335 students transferred to public universities in Texas from the seven campuses of the Dallas County Community College District but only 1,137 of them had completed 60 credits and were eligible to enroll at the University of Texas at Dallas; 417 of them did enroll at UT-Dallas. The 2,335 transfers were equal to 5.6 percent of the 41,554 enrolled in the DCCCD that fall.[5]

That same fall semester 13,748 students were enrolled in the three junior colleges located within commuting distance of the upper level University of Texas at Tyler. From those three junior colleges, 763 students transferred that fall to all public universities in Texas, of which 439 had 60 credits or more; 142 of them enrolled at UT-Tyler.

And, in the 1980 fall semester, 589 students transferred from the three junior colleges within commuting distance of the University of Texas of the Permian Basin to public universities in Texas, of which 297 had completed 60 credits; 168 enrolled at UT-Permian Basin. The 589 who transferred equaled 7.8 percent of the 7,594 enrolled at the three junior colleges that fall, one of the highest transfer rates in the state.

The statewide average of students transferring from community colleges to public baccalaureate degree institutions that fall was approximately 6 percent of the enrollment in all public community colleges in

Texas. This figure is consistent with the findings of a study by Arthur M. Cohen, director of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges at UCLA and his associate, John Lombardi. They reported that "in 1977 transfers totaled 5,100 of the 181,000 (junior college) students in Washington, 10,200 of the 357,000 in Illinois, and 41,000 of the more than 1,000,000 California students. On paper the university parallel programs remained intact; but the transfer function was a marked casualty of the 1970s ."[6]

A 1982 report in Texas was headlined "Data Show 24% of Junior College Students Transfer."[7] Closer examination showed this figure was arrived at by excluding students who had enrolled for six credits or less, which accounts for more than one-third and, in some cases, more than one-half of the enrollment in Texas community colleges. It also excluded students who enrolled for the fall class studied who did not re-enroll the following spring semester. When adjusted for these exclusions, the report's findings were essentially consistent with other transfer figures.

Analyses of community college transfer data collected by the Texas Coordinating Board in 1978, 1979 and 1980 showed that an average of about 10 to 12 percent of students who enroll in Texas community/junior colleges may eventually transfer to baccalaureate institutions, a high percentage compared with most states.

If vocational-technical students are excluded, the percentage who transfer would increase and yet studies show that a substantial minority of that group transfers. Friedlander reported that of the students who transferred from community colleges in New York State to senior colleges and universities in 1974, 30 percent had been enrolled in vocational programs.[8]

If upper level institutions had to depend solely on junior college transfers, many of them would soon be closed. In some upper level institutions, graduate students account for more than half of the total enrollment -- almost two-thirds at the University of Houston at Clear Lake and at John F. Kennedy University in California.[9] And in several upper level institutions, transfers from four-year institutions account for almost half of the new undergraduate admissions.

Transfer Courses. Lack of freshman and sophomore courses severely handicaps the opportunity for upper level institutions to provide students the best education. Many students who transfer from junior colleges to upper level institutions, both in Texas and other states, lack essential lower division courses or have been away from college so long they have forgotten the subject matter. This problem is solved easily in a four-year institution by enrolling the student in a freshman or sophomore course he lacks or needs to repeat while he is pursuing more advanced courses. Faculty and counselors in upper level institutions report that attempts to persuade students to return to a junior college to complete such courses usually meet with reluctance and often refusal to do so.

The problem is particularly serious where engineering students lack calculus, or students lack a lower division course in their major field of study such as accounting, chemistry, physics, and the like. As a result, a great deal of faculty time is spent tutoring students informally on material which should be covered in a lower division course.

The Texas Coordinating Board has issued core curricula for students to follow in junior colleges in order to be prepared fully upon enrolling in a university, but for a variety of reasons, many students do not complete

the prescribed core curriculum. Even with good counseling at the junior college, many students do not follow that counseling or change their curricular plans or digress from the core for a variety of reasons. Professor Arthur M. Cohen concluded that not one in a hundred students completes the transfer curriculum in the community college catalog in the recommended time and sequence.[10]

Students in both community colleges and senior colleges change curricula, several times in some cases. In an upper level institution, if a student decides to change curriculum he is faced with going to another university or a community college to take lower division courses needed. As a result, to avoid transferring, some students complete a bachelor's degree in a field with which they have become dissatisfied.

Curriculum Planning. Lack of freshman and sophomore courses forces the upper level institution to concentrate the student's study in his major field and supporting disciplines. Although it was once standard practice to segregate the student's general education in the first two years and professional education in the last two, experienced faculty advisers have learned that some students do poorly in certain freshman and sophomore courses but do well in them when they are more mature. This appears to be especially true of engineering, business and other professionally oriented students in the cases of philosophy, the arts, literature and other humanities courses. If some of those courses are postponed until their senior year, students often enjoy and profit from them more. This is not possible in an upper level institution.

At the November 1979 meeting of presidents and chancellors of upper level institutions, one president in discussing this and related problems

summed it up this way: "Upper level universities are so busy training people in the two years they have them that there is no opportunity to educate them."

Degree Programs. Another handicap of small upper level institutions is the fact that their undergraduate degree offerings are considerably influenced by, and even limited to, the curricular interests of students who attend junior colleges. For example, the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, located in the center of oil rich west Texas, is expected by local industries to provide a supply of well-trained engineers. Unfortunately, relatively few students who desire to study engineering attend junior colleges. Most high school students who plan to study engineering tend to have higher grades and SAT scores, be more goal oriented, and have decided through counseling and other means that success in completing an engineering degree is enhanced by enrolling as a freshman at the institution from which they plan to graduate.

A related problem for upper level institutions is the difficulty of providing preparation in disciplines for which demand is low but the graduates of which are needed in the region. To illustrate: One upper level institution in Texas reported that it had only 15 students majoring in Spanish and could afford only one full-time faculty member in Spanish, plus occasional adjunct teachers. In upper level institutions, course enrollments are often made up solely of students majoring in the discipline, occasionally with a few students taking a minor in that discipline. Due to need for Spanish teachers in the public schools, it was not feasible to terminate the curriculum in Spanish.

At the same time, a private, four-year university across the state with more than 8,000 enrollment had only twelve students majoring in Spanish but, due to demand for lower division general education courses in Spanish, there were six full-time faculty in Spanish in the university. As a consequence, the university could provide a broader and richer program in Spanish for its twelve majors.

The problem of a critical mass in a given discipline occurs in upper level institutions with enrollments of 5,000 or more, as well as in smaller institutions. Among those disciplines often affected are music, chemistry, physics, speech, foreign languages, anthropology, and drama. Chemistry is a good example. To provide a minimal quality chemistry baccalaureate program requires four faculty -- one each in organic, inorganic, physical and analytical chemistry. An upper level university with 4,000 enrollment might have 25 juniors and seniors majoring in chemistry which would justify two faculty members, assuming a 14:1 student-faculty ratio, not unusual for upper level institutions. This leaves the chemistry program half staffed in terms of program needs yet, if chemistry is allotted four faculty members, it can be done only by depriving other disciplines of faculty. In a university with large lower division classes this can be done without serious harm but, in an upper level institution where most classes are small and it is frequently possible to offer only required courses, it may not be possible to transfer faculty positions without harming the affected degree programs.

Ambiance. The presence and quality of extra-curricular and co-curricular activities in a college or university does much not only to

make the college experience more pleasant but does, in fact, significantly enrich it educationally. To achieve this, there needs to be a core of full-time, resident students around which a student life program can be developed.

A complete student life program includes clubs of different kinds, sororities and fraternities, intra-mural and intercollegiate sports, lecture series, film series, special celebrations, dances and other entertainment events, recreational activities of various types, and many more. Without a core of resident students these are virtually impossible to develop adequately.

Almost all upper level institution students are commuters. Only three or four institutions have campus housing and for only a small portion of the enrollment. Added to that is the fact that at most upper level institutions the average student age is 30 or higher, and most students attend part time. David P. Bell, of the University of Houston System staff, found in his 1979 study that in at least half of the upper level institutions two-thirds or more of the students attended part time and, in all except two institutions, at least half of the enrollment consisted of part-time students.[11]

Most students in upper level institutions are married and have established their social lives outside the university. The kind of student life program typically found in a four-year institution does not fit their wants or needs.

At a national meeting of upper level institution presidents and chancellors on the campus of the University of Houston at Clear Lake in April 1978, all those in attendance agreed that one of the most difficult problems

on their campuses was the development of student life activities. No president or chancellor was able to report significant success in this respect; all were groping for ways to improve it and, at the same time, recognized that the nature of the institution militated against success.

At the Clear Lake conference, most of the presidents or chancellors reported insignificant intercollegiate athletics on their campuses. While intercollegiate athletics are not crucial to student learning, their absence diminishes student spirit and impairs the development of public interest and support of the institution. Some upper level institutions compete in minor collegiate sports but none has a football team.

One president pointed out that no public college or university in the country has achieved acclaim, academic or otherwise, without a credible football team and, while all of the institutional heads recognized the headaches that go with intercollegiate athletics, they also agreed that major competitive sports programs could significantly benefit their institutions.

Lack of student life activities constitutes one of the major barriers to gaining acceptance of upper level institutions among potential students and appears to be one of the major reasons why more students who go away to college do not stay home and attend a community college and the nearby upper level university. It also accounts, at least in part, for the fact that two-thirds of the junior college student transfers go to four-year residential institutions rather than transferring to upper level institutions. Interviews with junior college students have identified this as a major factor in their decision not to attend an upper level institution.

Community Service Courses. Most upper level institutions are expected to concentrate their services on the communities and areas where they are located. For four-year institutions, this means admitting older adults to take courses in which they have a particular interest, although they do not wish to pursue a degree. The requirement that enrollees have completed two years of college to enroll in upper level institutions prevents many individuals from doing so.

At the University of Texas of the Permian Basin, courses such as History of the Oil Industry, History of the Southwest, Behavioral Modification in Child Rearing, and The Bible as Literature have been popular with older adults not interested in degree programs, but at least half of those applying were turned away because they had not completed two years of college.

Recently, this has been eased by legislation so that such persons can enroll with less college preparation. Some other upper level institutions can admit students with as few as 48 semester credits and, under some circumstances, even fewer credits, but this is still too restrictive for many adults.

Academic Excellence. Several upper level institutions have been able to develop high quality academic programs due largely to the fact that they were established at the time a surplus of Ph.D. trained faculty became available in most disciplines. As a consequence, many of the institutions staffed their faculties with individuals who had received the Ph.D. from the better graduate schools in the country, much more competent faculty than most of those institutions would have been able to recruit a decade earlier.

Still, there are serious barriers to academic achievement. For example, an upper level institution cannot enroll National Merit Scholars; it cannot have a Phi Beta Kappa Chapter or several other honorary societies, although some honorary societies do not exclude upper level institutions. It cannot have an ROTC program, except as a branch of a four-year university. Although upper level institutions have generally succeeded in becoming accredited, the possibility of denial of accreditation exists. The College of the Pacific in Stockton, California, eliminated the lower division in the mid-thirties but reinstituted it in 1951 due, in part, to denial of accreditation by the American Chemical Society and fear of non-accreditation by other accreditation bodies.

Brain Drain. One of the complaints of community leaders in isolated areas that lack a baccalaureate institution is that the brightest high school graduates go away to college and never return. Thus, the area is deprived of its best potential leaders for government, business, industry, and education. Communities in which upper level institutions were established have found that this phenomenon has changed only slightly.

Most students who attend upper level institutions are place bound -- by job, family, lack of money, or other reasons. Unless they fall into this category, most of the brightest high school graduates do not attend the local community college and nearby upper level institution but still go away to college. Hence, the establishment of an upper level institution does not halt the brain drain from those communities. Leaders in those communities admit that a four-year institution would not halt the brain drain, however, they believe it would significantly reduce it in a way that an upper level institution cannot.

Early Upper Level Institutions. In his seminal study, The Upper Level College, which was then and is still the only book length examination of the upper level movement, Robert A. Altman says that the first upper level institution was the University of Georgia which, in 1861, created a separate collegiate institute to handle freshman and sophomore years. With the coming of the Civil War, this arrangement lasted only 30 months; after the War the University opened as a four-year institution.[12]

From the founding of the University of Chicago in 1892, President William Rainey Harper began to pursue the idea of a separate entity to provide freshman and sophomore education. He believed the first two years should be preparatory and the last two years should be "university," after the German university model. He created a junior college consisting of the first two years at the University and urged public schools to create junior colleges. This led to the establishment of a junior college at Joliet, Illinois, the first public junior college in the country. Later, President Robert M. Hutchins instituted many innovations at the University of Chicago, including the two-year B.A. degree in 1944. With the coming of a new president in 1953, the two year B.A. was abandoned.[13]

The College of the Pacific, primarily for financial reasons, turned its lower division over to the newly formed local junior college in 1935 and rented classroom space to the junior college. For a variety of reasons, the College reinstituted a lower division in 1951.[14]

As previously noted, the University of Michigan established upper level campuses at Flint and Dearborn in the 1950s but, due primarily to

low enrollments, both campuses were converted to four-year institutions. Both campuses had been established as upper level institutions because of opposition from junior colleges in Flint and Dearborn but meager enrollment, coupled with rapid growth of former teachers' colleges in other Michigan cities, led local leaders to request four-year status for those two upper level campuses.[15]

The New School for Social Research in New York City, which was created in 1919 to offer non-credit adult education and later graduate study, added an upper level evening degree division in 1944. This was in response to the passage of the GI Bill in the Congress that year. After years of low enrollment, the upper level program was shifted in 1966 to a day program but when fewer than 100 enrollees appeared, the program was folded.[16]

In 1957 the Missouri Synod of the Lutheran Church established Concordia Senior College, an upper level institution, in Fort Wayne, Indiana, to serve its ten Synod junior colleges but within a few years the college was moved to Ann Arbor, Michigan where it opened as a four-year college.

Richmond College, as previously noted, was initially intended to be a four-year college on Staten Island but,due to opposition from Staten Island Community College plus the enthusiasm of some planners with the upper level concept, it opened in 1965 as an upper level college. As a component of the City University of New York system, Richmond was merged with Staten Island Community College following the 1974 financial retrenchment of CUNY.

Specialized Upper Level Institutions. In addition to the 24 comprehensive academic institutions without lower divisions, there are several specialized institutions without freshman and sophomore classes. Due to their specialized character, they are not always included in studies of upper level institutions. Bell's study excluded single discipline and narrowly defined upper level institutions, as did Altman's study.

In this category are Walsh College of Accountancy and Business Administration in Troy, Michigan, established in 1968 as a non-profit, private institution without lower division offerings.

The Monterey Institute of International Studies in California offers bachelor's and master's degree programs and enrolls fewer than 500 students. An independent non-profit institution, it emphasizes foreign language studies with programs for the Federal government, especially the Defense Department.

Pacific Oaks College, a small upper level and master's degree granting college in Pasadena, California, enrolls fewer than 300 students and specializes in the education of elementary school teachers.

The Sacred Heart School of Theology in Milwaukee also offers no lower division studies. Numerous theological seminaries throughout the U.S. offer only graduate studies, some only the doctorate.

In addition, many art schools offering the baccalaureate degree provide no academic courses but require their students to complete academic courses equivalent to one and one-half or two years of study elsewhere, either before enrolling or concurrent with their art studies.

The Quebec Plan. A variation on the junior college-upper level university sequence in the U.S. has been instituted in Quebec and,notwithstanding some criticisms by university faculty, it appears to be working better than the U.S. plan.[17] In 1961, the National government of Canada established a commission to study post-secondary education in Quebec. As a result of that study, 50 colleges of general and professional education, referred to commonly by the French acronym CEGEP (college d'enseignement general et professionnel), were established providing two years of academic education and three years of vocational-technical education. By the mid 1970's, all Quebec high school graduates desiring to attend a university were required to have completed two years at a CEGEP. At the same time, the universities reduced time required for the baccalaureate from four years to three years.

Most of the problems upper level universities in the U.S. experience with junior college transfers are eliminated or ameloriated in the Quebec plan. Foremost is the fact that completion of a CEGEP is required for admission to a university, thereby placing all universities on an equal footing in attracting students. Second, the curricula to be completed at CEGEPs are set forth in detail by the Quebec Ministry of Education, thereby assuring standard curricular preparation for students who transfer. Third, the Quebec Ministry of Education has issued a compendium of objectives and content of each course taught in the CEGEPs which further assures standard pre-university preparation. Fourth, by having the students for three years, the universities are able to provide curricula that will ensure greater quality than is possible at U.S. upper level universities which are responsible for only two years toward the baccalaureate.

The Status of Upper Level Institutions. In his 1979 study, Bell pointed out that as of that date no upper level institution created prior to 1964 still existed; all had either been closed or converted to four-year institutions. Of the upper level institutions created in the 1960s and 1970s , Richmond College had already merged with a community college when Bell's study was published.

Since Bell's study, the Florida Legislature has authorized all of its upper level institutions to accept freshmen and sophomores. To be sure, the Florida Legislature mandated limited freshman and sophomore enrollments in the upper level institutions,a prudent response to the Florida junior colleges that had waged a vigorous and sustained battle against the addition of freshmen and sophomores to upper level institutions. Florida International University in Miami, whose upper level status was established by the state university Board of Regents, was allowed to accept freshmen in 1981,and the University of West Florida accepted freshmen in the fall of 1983. The University of North Florida at Jacksonville and Florida Atlantic University at Boca Raton accepted freshmen in the fall of 1984.

The University of Texas at Dallas and the University of Texas of the Permian Basin were created by the 1969 Texas Legislature, in spite of concerted pleadings of citizen groups from Dallas and Odessa for four-year institutions. In 1971, prior to the opening of the universities, legislation was introduced to add lower divisions to both institutions; it passed the House but failed in the Senate committee by one vote. In 1973, the Odessa legislator reintroduced the UT-Permian Basin bill which passed in the House but died in the Senate.

In the 1983 legislative session, a bill to permit UT-Permian Basin to accept freshmen and sophomores passed in the Senate,and there were reportedly vote pledges to pass it in the House,but the bill was bottled up in the Calendar Committee until the session ended. Defeat of four-year status for UT-Permian Basin resulted each time from efforts by junior colleges, plus a group of leaders in the city of Midland, 20 miles from Odessa, who were disappointed that the University was placed in Odessa rather than in Midland County. In Dallas, opposition comes from junior colleges and especially Southern Methodist University, several of whose graduates are members of the Legislature.

Dr. Alfred R. Neumann, the late Chancellor of the University of Houston at Clear Lake, reported that the faculty and staff on that campus would prefer four-year status, although he personally liked the upper level model. Dr. Neumann had been educated through the gymnasium level in Germany and likened upper level institutions to the German university.

Little effort has been made in other states to add freshmen and sophomore years to upper level institutions. A few years ago, an upper level university president in Illinois said, "We know it (the upper level concept) was a bum idea; we're just waiting for the legislature to discover it."

As in Florida and Texas, opposition by junior colleges in most states makes addition of freshmen and sophomores difficult, if not impossible. And,because of the necessity of working cooperatively with junior colleges, most upper level administrators and faculty are discreet about their views on adding freshmen and sophomores. In some communities where citizen groups have promoted four-year status for upper level insti-

tutions, the presidents and chancellors, in order to maintain harmonious relationships, have found it necessary to reassure junior colleges that they do not seek four-year status for their institutions.

Further, there are at least two specialized upper level institutions for which a case can be made for retaining their upper level status. The State University of New York College of Technology at Utica-Rome was established primarily to provide upper level education to graduates of technical programs in two-year colleges.

Metropolitan State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, was not created to serve immediate junior college transfers primarily but rather to be a highly innovative institution to serve older adults. Located in a downtown high rise office building, it offers courses in dozens of locations throughout the city -- cafeterias, store fronts, and the like -- and emphasizes life experiences for credit. It relies primarily on part-time faculty for teaching.

In others, legislators are reluctant to consider adding freshmen and sophomores to upper level institutions because to do so would mean expansion of higher education in the state. In several states legislators feel they have already overbuilt higher education institutions.

In an era of projected college enrollment decline, there has been little consideration in recent years of additional higher education institutions, upper level or otherwise. However, from time to time a legislator or study group revives the possibility of converting existing four-year institutions to upper level institutions. A few years ago, a bill was introduced in the Maryland Legislature to eliminate freshman and sophomore years at the University of Maryland-College Park. It gained little support.

In the late 1970s , a bill was introduced in the Florida Legislature to eliminate the lower division of all state universities in Florida. Aside from educational and political considerations, supporters of intercollegiate football at the University of Florida and Florida State University quickly dispelled the idea, along with support from legislators whose children looked forward to a four-year education at one of the four-year institutions in the state.

Mission. The mission and orientation of upper level institutions vary greatly. Metropolitan State University offers the bachelor's degree only with emphasis on life experience. The University of Texas at Dallas absorbed as its initial faculty the Southwest Center for Advanced Studies, a high level research organization in the physical sciences composed of 50 Ph.D. scientists, most of them world renowned.

Most of the upper level institutions are community or regionally oriented. But as the original faculties and administrations are replaced, newcomers bring their own experience and agendas, and several of the institutions are rethinking their identity. Should they become research universities or concentrate on teaching and community service? Should they continue the academic innovations that characterized most of the institutions originally? Should interdisciplinary programs give way to traditional curricula? And many more questions.

Merging. In most cases where upper level institutions have added or considered adding lower divisons, consideration has been given to merging with a nearby junior college. Richmond College on Staten Island did so but, according to administrators, it resulted in much trauma and conflict.

Before the Florida legislature took action affecting all upper level institutions in the spring of 1983, the University of West Florida and

Pensacola Junior College had well underway studies directed toward merging those two institutions, precipitated primarily by community leaders who saw need for a four-year university in Pensacola but saw little hope of adding a lower division to the University of West Florida.

In 1961, prior to the establishment of the University of West Florida, Professor John Guy Fawkes of the University of Wisconsin was employed to study the feasibility of a university in Pensacola. He urged that Pensacola Junior College not become a four-year institution, that if it did within a short time Pensacola would need to establish another junior college since junior colleges can provide services for a community that four-year colleges do less well.

Community leaders in Odessa, Texas, have from time to time advanced the idea of merging UT-Permian Basin and Odessa College, partly to relieve the county property owners of several million dollars in taxes collected each year by the junior college taxing district to support operating expenses and to retire bonded indebtedness for campus construction. Local taxes pay about half of the operating expenses of Odessa College. More recently, local leaders appear to have reached the same conclusion that John Guy Fawkes did. In addition, earlier fears of some Odessa leaders that adding a lower division to UT-Permian Basin would harm junior college enrollment appear to have abated. Investigations showed that where lower divisions were added to upper level institutions or where four-year colleges were established near junior colleges, enrollment in the latter declined only slightly and the junior colleges recovered their enrollments within three years.

What's Ahead? With the conversion of all of the upper level universities in Florida to four-year institutions, the oldest general academic upper level institution in the country is John F. Kennedy University in Orinda, California, near Berkeley, which opened in 1965.

Because of the history of upper level institutions being converted to four-year institutions, one might expect existing upper level institutions to disappear, especially in light of what is now known about them that was not known fifteen years ago. There appears to be some likelihood that one or two upper level institutions in Texas may be authorized to accept freshmen and sophomores within a few years, but there is little reason to expect a nationwide movement of this kind soon. Such conversions are political decisions and properly so in a democracy. But it is apparent that legislators and higher education planners will be guided more by non-educational considerations, and one may reasonably expect legislatures to move slowly in adding freshmen and sophomores to upper level institutions.

Citations

1. Robert A. Altman, The Upper Level College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1370) pp. 137-140.

2. Ibid., p. 136.

3. Annual Statistical Reports, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, Austin, Texas.

4. Jack Friedlander, unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C. March 7, 1980.

5. Texas Coordinating Board, unpublished computer print-out.

6. Arthur M. Cohen and John Lombardi, "Can the Community Colleges Survive Success," Change, November-December, 1979, p. 25.

7. CB Report, Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, January, 1982.

8. Friedlander, op. cit.

9. David P. Bell, A National Study of Upper Level Universities (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1981) p. 20.

10. Arthur M. Cohen, unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 7, 1980.

11. Bell, op. cit., p. 20.

12. Altman, op. cit., p. 11.

13. Ibid, p. 77.

14. Ibid., p. 75.

15. Ibid., pp. 128, 164.

16. Ibid., p. 149.

17. Interviews with administrators at John Abbott College and McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, August 3, 1983.